

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 02-1804**

---

KASSAHUN WAGAW WORKNEH,

Petitioner,

versus

JOHN ASHCROFT, Attorney General; U.S.  
IMMIGRATION & NATURALIZATION SERVICE,

Respondents.

---

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration  
Appeals. (A77-252-385)

---

Submitted: May 9, 2003

Decided: May 19, 2003

---

Before WILLIAMS, MOTZ, and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges.

---

Petition denied by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Mikre Michael Ayele, Arlington, Virginia, for Petitioner. Robert D. McCallum, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, M. Jocelyn Lopez Wright, Senior Litigation Counsel, Nelda C. Reyna, Office of Immigration Litigation, Civil Division, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, Washington, D.C., for Respondents.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Kassahun Wagaw Workneh, native and citizen of Ethiopia, seeks review of a decision of the Board of Immigration Appeals affirming without opinion the decision of the immigration judge (IJ) denying Workneh's application for asylum and withholding of removal. We have reviewed the administrative record and the IJ's decision. We find that the IJ's ruling that Workneh failed to establish past persecution or a well-founded fear of future persecution, as necessary to qualify for asylum relief, is not manifestly contrary to the law or an abuse of discretion. 8 U.S.C. § 1252(b)(4)(D); see 8 C.F.R. 208.13(b) (2003) (eligibility for asylum).

The standard for receiving withholding of removal is "more stringent than that for asylum eligibility." Chen v. INS, 195 F.3d 198, 205 (4th Cir. 1999). An applicant for withholding must demonstrate a clear probability of persecution. INS v. Cardoza-Fonseca, 480 U.S. 421, 430-31 (1987). As Workneh has failed to establish his eligibility for asylum, he cannot satisfy the higher standard for withholding of removal.

We accordingly deny the petition for review. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal arguments are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

PETITION DENIED